

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/719,632	11/21/2003	Robert C. O'Brien	31611.0028	3465
33751	7590 11/02/2005		EXAM	INER
WILSON GREATBATCH TECHNOLOGIES, INC. 10,000 WEHRLE DRIVE			FAULCON JR	, LENWOOD
CLARENCE,			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
- · · · · · · · · · · ·			3762	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			TWA				
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/719,632	O'BRIEN ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Lenwood Faulcon, Jr.	3762				
Period fe	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with th	ne correspondence address				
VVHI - Exte after - If NO - Failt Any	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Do consist of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 TO SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. TO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the provision of t	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT. 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply b will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS f e, cause the application to become ABANDO	ION. e timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 O	<u> 0ctober 2005</u> .					
2a) <u></u>	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
4)🖂	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)[5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	S)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are rejected.						
·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)[_]	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers						
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	epted or b) objected to by the	ne Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	kaminer. Note the attached Off	ice Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	9(a)-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All _b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	•	eived in this National Stage				
* 6	application from the International Bureau	• • • •	S. a.d.				
Š	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	or the certified copies not rece	elvea.				
Attachmer	ut(s)	•					
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summ					
	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mai 5) Notice of Inform	al Patent Application (PTO-152)				
	er No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	·				

Application/Control Number: 10/719,632 Page 2

Art Unit: 3762

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed September 27, 2005, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Claims 1-26 stand rejected for the reasons set forth in the previous Office Action of August 12, 2005. The amendments to claims 1, 11, 14, 20 and 25, contain language in the alternative, which do not overcome the prior art rejections of the previous Office Action of August 12, 2005. Further, in regards to the amendments of claims 1, 11, 14, 20 and 25, Examiner takes the position that Lieber et al. has no teaching that would suggest that the carbon-containing nanotubes of that reference do not exhibit a relatively low polarization at their first end with respect to their second free end. For these reasons, in light of the previous Office Action of August 12, 2005, claims 1-26 stand rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 1-5 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malonek et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,292,704) in view of Lieber et al. (U.S. 2002/0117659.

Malonek et al. teaches of high capacitance implantable electrodes, which comprise a substrate selected from the group of platinum, platinum-iridium, titanium and carbon (col. 3 lines 65-67). Malonek et al. further teaches of the implantable electrodes comprising a coating supported on the substrate (col. 3 lines 10-15). Malonek et al. also teaches that the coating may be selected from a group of materials including iridium oxide, titanium nitride (col. 4 lines 3-5), and the materials are inherently biocompatible and electrically conductive based on their known characteristics. Malonek et al. further teaches of the use of metal nitrides in particle coatings (col. 1 lines 61-62) and the use of heat treatment on the substrate (col. 9 lines 11-15). Malonek et al. teaches of methods for making implantable

Art Unit: 3762

stimulation electrodes, which may comprise a metal substrate coated with tantalum oxide (col. 1 lines 27-37). Malonek et al. does not teach the use of a multiplicity of carbon-containing nanotubes adhering to the coating.

Lieber et al. teaches the use of carbon containing nanotubes, nanowires and nanorods (paragraph 79), for use in implantable medical devices, such as measurement and sensory devices (paragraph 162).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Malonek et al. with those of Lieber et al. Since both Malonek et al. and Lieber et al. involve the same field of endeavor, which includes implantable medical devices that utilize electrodes comprised of various substrates and coatings, they teach of analogous arts. It would have been obvious to modify the lead and methods of Malonek et al. by adhering a multiplicity of carbon-containing nanotubes to the coating for the purpose of strengthening the electrode. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Malonek et al. and Lieber et al. to meet the limitations of claims 1-5.

3. Claims 6, 7, 14-19 and 25-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malonek et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,292,704) in view of Lieber et al. (U.S. 2002/0117659) as applied to claims 1-5 and 10 above, and further in view of Smalley et al. (U.S. 2002/0085968).

Smalley et al. teaches of a method for producing self-assembled objects comprising nanotubes that may be used singularly or in multiples (paragraph 16), for use in biocompatible implants (paragraph 276). Smalley et al. also teaches the use of nanotube ropes (paragraph 68). Smalley et al. further teaches of the use of nanotubes of carbon-

Art Unit: 3762

doped boron nitride (paragraph 267). Smalley et al. also teaches of the use of binder precursors of any transition metal catalyst including iridium and platinum (paragraph 161), in oxidizing conditions (paragraph 166). Smalley et al. also teaches of the use of plasma assisted chemical vapor deposition process (paragraph 72) and providing throughout the process by way of a microwave (paragraph 171).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Malonek et al. and Lieber et al. as applied to claims 1-5 and 10 above, with the teachings of Smalley et al. Malonek et al., Lieber et al. and Smalley et al. teach of analogous art, since they disclose applications of implantable medical devices that utilize electrodes. Modifying the electrodes as taught by Malonek et al. and Lieber et al. with the teachings of Smalley et al. to increase the strength and durability of the electrode would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, since the various types of nanotubes are known for the strength characteristics.

4. Claims 8, 9 and 11-13, 20-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malonek et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,292,704) in view of Lieber et al. (U.S. 2002/0117659) as applied to claims 1-7, 10, 14-15, 18-19 and 25-26 above, and further in view of Croci et al. (U.S. 2004/0151835).

Croci et al. teaches of a method for forming a coating film, consisting of nanotubes (paragraph 1). Croci et al. further teaches of growing the nanotubes from a reaction gas of acetylene (paragraph 66), which may also contain ammonium (paragraph 25) and the use of a hydrogen gas stream in the operation of forming the carbon nanotube coating on the substrate (paragraph 25). Croci et al. further teaches of maintaining the temperature of the substrate between 300°C and 1500°C during formation of the nanotubes (paragraph 29)

Page 5

and then allowing the substrate to cool in a solution of iron nitrate, which also contains hydrogen (paragraph 51). Croci et al. further teaches of the use of nitrogen as a diluting gas (paragraph 26). Further, the limitation of cooling the nanotube coated substrate in hydrogen as stated in claim 13 lacks criticality.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Malonek et al. and Lieber et al. as applied to claims 1-7, 10, 14-15, 18-19 and 25-26 above, with the teachings of Croci et al. Both Lieber et al. and Croci et al. deal with the problem of growing effective nanotubes by use of reaction gases, and thus are analogous arts. Modifying the reaction entity as taught by Lieber et al. (paragraph 65) with the teachings of Croci et al. would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, to increase the property characteristics of the nanotube.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Cowland (U.S. Patent No. 3,722,005), Richter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,281,668), Parsonage et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,338,430), Lorenz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,587,200), Nanci et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,876,454), Schueller et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,143,412), Loftus et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,755,530), Mech et al. (U.S. 2002/0120296), Parsonage et al. (U.S. 2003/0093107), Supronowicz et al. (U.S. 2003/0153965), Motamedi et al. (U.S. 2004/0023317), Chen et al. (W.O. 3/049,219).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lenwood Faulcon, Jr. whose telephone number is 571-272-6090. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 9 to 5 pm.

Application/Control Number: 10/719,632

Art Unit: 3762

Page 6

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela D. Sykes, can be reached on 571-272-4955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Primary Examiner